District VI Advisory Board Minutes www.wichita.gov

Wednesday March 17, 2010 6:30 p.m.

Evergreen Recreation Center 2700 N. Woodland **Lounge Clubroom**

The District VI Advisory Board meeting was held at 6:30 p.m. at the Evergreen Recreation Center Lounge Clubroom 2700 N. Woodland. District VI councilwoman led the meeting with five (5) District Advisory Board members in attendance, two (2) city staff and seventeen (17) members of the public who signed in.

Members Present

Marsha Carr Bob Aldrich Pat Randleas Carol Skaff

John VanWalleghen

Members Absent

Jaya Escobar Charlie Claycomb Scott Dunakey

Staff Present

Terri Dozal, Neighborhood Assistant Dale Miller, Planner

Council Member Janet Miller called the meeting to order at 6:40 p.m. welcoming everyone. Miller asked members to introduce themselves and state their representation on the board.

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved as submitted (Carr/Skaff 5-0)

Public Agenda

1. **Scheduled items:** No items were discussed. 2. **Off-agenda items:** No items were discussed.

*****Action: Provide comments/take appropriate action

Staff Presentations

Planning

3. CON2010-00007

The District VI Advisory Board (DAB) considered a City Conditional Use to permit a neighborhood swimming pool generally located approximately 2,950 feet north of 53rd Street North and west of North Meridian Avenue. (2602 58th Court North).

The members were provided the MAPD staff report for review prior to the meeting. Dale Miller, Planner presented the case background, reviewed the staff recommendation and answered questions of members and the public.

The Board asked the following questions/comments: Responses in Italics

- Would there be adequate parking for the pool area? Yes.
- If the pool stayed open late would there be adequate parking? There is adequate parking available.

There were no members of the public to speak in favor or opposition of the request.

****Action: The District VI Advisory Board members made a motion to recommend to City Council Approval (Aldrich/VanWalleghen 5-0) of the conditional use request.

4. CON2010-00008

The District VI Advisory Board (DAB) considered a City Conditional Use to permit wrecking and salvage at 2901 N. Mead. The members were provided the MAPD staff report for review prior to the meeting. *Dale Miller*, Planner presented the case background, reviewed the staff recommendation and answered questions of members and the public. Miller acknowledged Cargill had already sold this property to Midwest Scrap after the staff report was finished and the attraction for this site is due to the rail service to the West. Anything they take in will be shipped out and there will be no vehicle salvage.

Aldrich acknowledged he has an involvement with the case as he is a member of Bridgeport Association but this would not effect his decision tonight.

Robert Kaplan, Attorney for the applicant presented a power point on the type of facility this would be and stated that natural resources are precious to reclaim. This neighborhood is in the heart of industrial area and there is not a lot of heavy industrial property with rail assistance available, that's why they selected this site. This area has similar industries and the Cargill building will remain as a buffer and the recycling will be done in the back. The traffic will not see the operations to the south and non-ferrous materials will be stored indoors for security purposes. This business will shred, bale and ship its materials. The fencing will not be cinder or big blocks. *Kaplan* stated the he and the owner would be willing to meet with the neighbors to form some compromise.

The Board asked the following questions/comments: Responses in Italics

- How far is the existing metal recycling in the area from this location? Around 300 ft and Glickman's is around 50 ft. south.
- What is the height for screening when some of the piles are as high as 30ft.? 8ft.
- What would be the highest estimate of trucks coming to the property on a daily basis as the staff report said fewer than 20? Anywhere between 20-30 vehicles maybe 60 when the market is stronger.
- Will they recycle fuel tanks and tires? No cars with gas tanks or anything with fluid.
- What controls do you have in place to keep down dust? There will be water added as the mill work is
- Will there be hazardous liquid leaching into the ground? There will be concrete around the shredder and drainage will go into a water reclamation center. That water will be cleaned and re-used.
- Will there be retail of yard metal to the public? Yes, ferrous materials.
- Has the applicant met with the surrounding neighbors about the business they are bringing to the area? No, not yet.
- What impact will the existing businesses have from this recycling center?
- The business they have in Kansas City what is the area like where it's located? It's all heavy industry in an old steel mill.

Eight members of the public made the following comments, asked questions or expressed opposition of the conditional use request:

Rick Lowe, 1509 S. Spring Circle stated he represented Bridgeport which was founded in 2007 We are working on improving this neighborhood and we see it as a high quality Industrial Park. Many of the businesses do multimillion dollar work. I'm opposed to this request. With the 21st/ street revitalization in this area the city is investing money to clean-up visual blight and this business coming to 29th street is not good. In 2007, there was another conditional use request ¼ mile N. and East of 29th St. and it was denied. The MAPC noted the 21st/revitalization/businesses and investment in Bridgeport for their reasoning.

Thomas Olsen, HOC industries owns property in Bridgeport and said I don't want this since the case in 2007 by MAPC was rejected. We have spent lots of money on this to improve. There have been explosions that have scared us. They say they'll do and then they don't look at the Campbell property, OCI is not doing their job. We are working with MAPD to try and get a protective overlay so we don't see this kind of business come to our area. There has to be a better place to put recycling as this is detrimental to our area.

John Prather, 1813 Ridge Rd. El Dorado I own Klondyke with over 1000 truckers and 40 terminals in 17 states. I've owned land in Bridgeport for over 10 years. I've worked with city Hazmat Terminal and wanted regulations to come into the city so we can have like neighbors. This is the same family company for 77 yrs. and we outgrew 6 acres and have now purchased 17 acres at 29th/Ohio with 110 employees. I'm proud of my investment. I oppose this on behalf of my organization and feel somewhat a violated trust the city.

Louis Eftink, 1330 E. 37th/N. Design Construction Company I'm against this operation. I have between 40-50 employees and still growing. An 8 ft. fence doesn't hide anything as I could read the Cargill sign from the interstate. This is not good for the neighborhood.

Don Gerber, 2612 N. Longfellow owns quality property a warehouse in Bridgeport; it was a good investment and took me less than 6 months to get a tenant. It is a nice addition to the park. I'm concerned about retaining the property value if this turns into a blighted area plus the noise pollution and dust. I'm opposed.

Mike Boyed Hayne, 2228 N. Mead asked about airborne bits of steel from equipment and mentioned the Glickman explosion it shook my building and increased traffic in front of my building. I'm opposed.

Leonard Hicks, Bridgeport Association I've taken pictures of the facility In KC. The piles of materials are stacked closer to 50 ft. tall and an 8 ft. fence does not cover anything. Glickman has piles 40-50 ft. In KC they had a problem of gas tanks and tires thrown all over town because the recycling plants wouldn't take them. In 2003 a conditional use request was denied near 21st St. E. of Broadway due to visual blight. I'm opposed.

Doug Harding-570 S. Turquoise owns five properties. There will be bidding wars for the materials and will cause an influx of robbery. Protect our community. I oppose.

At this point, Kaplan asked for a rebuttal to the comments made and he stated this business is coming to the area because there is a problem finding industrial areas to do the recycling and where else could they go. This industry is essential.

Aldrich stated there are other locations they could go to.

Skaff asked why you wouldn't go further North as there are more railroad tracks and other suitable sites, *Kaplan* responded they researched other sites but in their opinion they could use this site more long term.

Randleas asked if these pictures are accurate of your business. Nick Hayes, owner responded they have a larger space with no height requirement. Randleas responded if she were a business owner she wouldn't want them in her area either.

Aldrich stated he had been involved in working on getting a protective overlay for this area. This is a pristine location with companies investing millions of dollars. The staff report says it would not be adverse to the neighborhood. Bridgeport is an attractive location with a variety of other uses and this business request is not conforming to the surrounding neighborhood. There currently are 6000 employees within these businesses and soon to see more expansion. OCI is not good with making businesses conform and they do what they shouldn't do. I'm opposed.

Carr stated she was sorry they already purchased this property. This is an opportunity to have an environmental excellent plan on how to mesh with your neighbors. I oppose.

VanWalleghen stated he was disappointed as there was a similar type case in 2007 and this was not listed in the staff report.

Council member Miller mentioned that DAB could do a deferral if they were not ready to make a decision but she would like to see the business work on some form of discussion with the Bridgeport association before hand and if not DAB could oppose.

Aldrich said there is not a whole lot that can be agree on as it is not conducive to area. They should have made contact to the neighbors first. VanWalleghen included that on numerous occasions DAB has chastised applicants for not contacting the neighbors first.

Carr asked if there was anyway staff could speak to realtors or prospective buyers on this about what the association wants. Aldrich responded they are already working on a protective overlay plan and it plainly spells out this is not conducive to the area. Skaff stated shouldn't that been revealed in the staff report and I say for them to look into other areas of the city. Randleas said she didn't have much faith in staff as they recommend everything.

****Action: The District VI Advisory Board members made a motion to recommend to City Council to deny (Carr/Skaff 5-0) the conditional use request based upon previous background information of prior applicants and the Bridgeport Association members' comments

Board Agenda

Problem Properties

2942 N. Market: Pile of tires

Graffiti: tagged with Loco Boys and a pitchfork on the southeast abutment on 11th Street bridge and the

southwest end also. Also, a light pole on the bridge was tagged.

Graffiti: I-235-floodway tagged again.

*****Action: Receive and propose appropriate action.

Neighborhood Reports

***** Action: Receive and file.

Updates from councilmember

Announcements

Next DAB meeting will be on Monday, April 5, 2010

With no further business to discuss the meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m. (Skaff/Carr 5-0)

Guests

Dick L. Siemer

Clare D (Denise) O'Leary-Siemer

Tom Carr

Doug Harding

Denise Gerber

John Prather

Dorree Hicks

Russ Ewv

Leonard and Leslie Hicks

Louis Eftink

Rick Lowe

Tom Olsen

Robert Kaplan

Nick Hayes

Kathy Dittmer

Brett Barrientos